2009 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-SB383)

Received: 02/24/2010				Received By: rnelson2		
Wanted: Today				Identical to LRB:		
For: Joe Parisi (608) 266-5342				By/Representing: Mike		
This file may be shown to any legislator: NO				Drafter: rnelson2		
May Contact:				Addl. Drafters:		
Subject: Courts - courts/judges/commsrs				Extra Copies:		
Submit via email: YES						
Requester's email:						
Carbon copy (CC:) to:						
Pre Topic:						
No specific pre topic giv	ven					
Topic:				Maria Maria Maria		
Sessions of muni court						
Instructions:						
See attached						
Drafting History:						
Vers. <u>Drafted</u>	Reviewed	<u>Typed</u>	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/1 rnelson2 02/24/2010	csicilia 02/24/2010	phenry 02/24/201	0	lparisi 02/24/2010	lparisi 02/24/2010	
FE Sent For:			<end></end>			

2009 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-SB383)

Received: 02/24/2010	Received By: rnelson2						
Wanted: Today	Identical to LRB:						
For: Joe Parisi (608) 266-5342	By/Representing: Mike						
This file may be shown to any legislator: NO	Drafter: rnelson2						
May Contact:	Addl. Drafters:						
Subject: Courts - courts/judges/commsrs	Extra Copies:						
Submit via email: YES							
Requester's email: Rep.Parisi@legis.wisconsin.gov							
Carbon copy (CC:) to:							
Pre Topic:							
No specific pre topic given							
Topic:							
Sessions of muni court							
Instructions:							
See attached							
Drafting History:							
Vers. <u>Drafted</u> <u>Reviewed</u> <u>Typed</u> <u>Proofed</u>	Submitted Jacketed Required						
Vers. <u>Drafted Reviewed Typed Proofed</u> /1 rnelson2 1 \(\tilde{\gamma} \) \(\frac{2\frac{1}{19}}{10} \) \(\frac{1}{10} \)	, L						
FE Sent For: $ \begin{array}{ccc} $							

Nelson, Robert P.

From:

Murray, Mike

Sent:

Wednesday, February 24, 2010 9:31 AM

To:

Nelson, Robert P.

Cc:

McKinny, Chris; Peterson, Eric

Subject:

FW: LRB 09a1638 Topic: Municipal court and consolidation

Attachments:

LRB a1638_1

Hi Bob.

Thanks so much for getting this amendment drafted. I think I was unclear in my drafting request though, so I need to clarify what I was asking for in regards to what happens in cases of municipal consolidation. What we wanted to clarify was that when two communities form into one through the consolidation process, any municipal courts that existed in the former communities would be <u>abolished</u>. I think that Section 1 of this amendment does the opposite. If you could please redraft sec. 1 of the amendment to reflect this, I would really appreciate it. Sec. 2 regarding the days of operation for the court looks good.

Thanks again Bob,

Mike in Rep. Parisi's Office

From: Basford, Sarah

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 1:59 PM

To: Rep.Parisi

Subject: LRB 09a1638 Topic: Municipal court and consolidation

The attached proposal has been jacketed for introduction.

A copy has also been sent to:

乙

09a16381.pdf (16 KB)



State of Misconsin 2009 - 2010 LEGISLATURE

This morning

LRBa1669/1 RPN:......

ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT, TO 2009 SENATE BILL 383

STET: leave as

Mich

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 1. Page 11, line 3: after "effect" insert "as part of a consolidation under s.

 $\frac{\sqrt{66.0229}}{66.0229}$ or".

2. Page 14, line 17: delete lines 17 to 20 and substitute:

"755.06 Sessions of court. The municipal court shall be open daily or as directed determined by the judge and approved by the governing body, but the governing body may by ordinance or bylaw allow the judge to determine when the court shall be open."

9

(END)